THE COURT: I have a bit of a struggle with talking because of Novocaine. Forgive me.

I'm going to let you do most of it. Go ahead, Mr. Shin.

MR. SHIN: Yes, your Honor. Just for the record, the government submitted a request last night by email to your Honor's chambers in which we flagged a potential scheduling issue, and so we recalled that during voir dire, the juror who was subsequently seated as juror number 2, she had raised a concern that on Monday, March 20th, which is this coming Monday, she had a work exam scheduled, and she --

THE COURT: Let me pause you.

Mr. Creizman, Mr. Lebedev's not here.

MR. CREIZMAN: Yes. I'm waiving his appearance with his permission. He emailed me from the -- he said he was on a train, that he was a passenger, he's on his way, and he says he'll be here shortly. But I told him about the nature of this particular conference, the issue that's being raised, and he agrees to waive his appearance.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Go ahead.

MR. SHIN: And so the juror stated at the time that she might be able to move it, but she didn't know. We also recalled that your Honor, toward the end of the trial, mentioned during one of our breaks that there were a number of potential juror issues that could come up in the near future,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and your Honor cited one of the juror's exams as one of those. Given that we're here on Friday, and the exam as originally stated would begin on Monday, we thought it would be prudent for the Court to inquire with that juror, first, whether she is still in fact scheduled to take the exam on Monday, and perhaps your Honor could also inquire as to when in the day it is, how long it might take, whether she thinks she would be in a position where, if it was early enough in the day, she could deliberate in the afternoon or whether she needs to get her head together and come back the next day.

In any event, based on that information, if she is in fact still taking the exam on Monday, the government submits that it would make sense to, one, go ahead and make a decision as to what to do about Monday. The government proposes that if she is taking the exam, the jury should be given a break or some or all of Monday to accommodate that juror, and if we were to make that decision, for the jury to be informed of that as early as possible today. Our thinking on that in terms of informing the juror, to relieve pressure that juror might feel about needing to get things done before the exam on Monday, and also it would permit the other jurors to make plans in the event that they were not to sit on Monday, they could maybe go in, catch up on work or not have to call in a babysitter, et cetera. This may all be moot if she did in fact move her exam, but we thought the best first step was to inquire with

1 | that juror.

2.3

THE COURT: There is the related issue of juror number 5 who, as you well recall, indicated over the snow day by email, and I conveyed, that she has tickets to chaperone the school trip leaving Sunday for eight days. I haven't communicated anything further with her. She was leaving last night and she said to Ms. Nuñez something along the lines of "I just want to make sure it's clear again, if we're not finished, I have these tickets". So I think for similar reasons we need to have a strategy with respect to at least those two jurors, and then I think assessing what other steps we might need to take.

MR. SHIN: Right, your Honor. So we're aware of that issue as well. I think those two conflicts, they are different of course in terms of one being, I assume, most of the day an exam, and the other being eight days, your Honor. So our thinking was that at least for the Monday issue with juror number 2, that again, given that that's coming up on Monday and it would be a relatively short break if in the end it's needed, but that's something that we could decide sooner rather than later and let the jury know.

Juror number 5, I mean, given that it's eight days, I think we would all agree that that juror should be excused if deliberations were to stretch past Sunday and she would be unavailable. Of course, your Honor would then have two

I think it would be appropriate to have the court staff notify one or more alternates that they may be needed Monday, and to please make themselves available as a consequence. Two, I think we should allow the deliberations to continue at least through the morning. It's apparent that the jury is working, there's no sign of anything other than an orderly deliberation, and I would counsel against making inquiry about any of these issues for the next couple of hours.

Obviously, as we get towards the middle to end of the day and it becomes more likely, or at least more plausible that the jury may not reach a conclusion today, then I think we should make some decisions.

Obviously, I agree that juror number 5 would have to be excused. She is simply unavailable past today. As to juror number 2, the jurors with respect to individual personal issues and conflicts have not been shy about letting us know, and we're talking about, of course, the foreperson who has been in direct communication with the Court

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Lebedev.

MR. KLINGEMAN: So I'm confident that she's aware of her schedule and her ability to advise us to that. In terms of her potential unavailability on Monday, since we would, I would hope, be seating an alternate for number 5 anyway, and your Honor would be advising the jury to start its deliberations anew, so to speak, I see no reason not to consider seating

another alternate for juror number 2.

\_\_\_

THE COURT: I'll just pause you on my thinking on the alternate. I don't think we can make that assessment until we know the broader landscape of the other jurors. Because if seating an alternate and starting over will quickly lead into multiple jurors needing to be excused, then we are in good cause territory for proceeding to 11.

MR. KLINGEMAN: Which is why I do suggest we wait at least a few hours to see what shakes out today before we open that Pandora's box by voir diring one or more of the jurors about next week.

THE COURT: Mr. Creizman.

MR. CREIZMAN: I could not have said it any better than Mr. Klingeman did, that he expressed my position fully.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CREIZMAN: Thank you.

MR. SHIN: Your Honor, I just don't see any harm in trying to get the information from the jurors as early as possible today so that your Honor and the parties could assess what we should do in light of the various circumstances at play. It would also — to the extent we make a decision earlier in the day about, for example, the government's proposal regarding taking a break on Monday for juror number 2, it would allow the Court, if we were to go down that road, to communicate that to the jury and allow them to start making

1 a. 2 I a. 3 t w. 5 a 6 t . 7 c

arrangements, for example, if they were to take a very brief —

I think they were deliberating over lunch, but if they were to

take a short break over lunch, it would allow them to make

whatever arrangements might be needed for Monday. Again, just

as a courtesy and consistent with what we've done previously in

terms of inquiring as early as possible and trying to be

courteous to their schedules, as well, in terms of giving them

advanced notice.

THE COURT: I guess a couple of things. The pattern that I've tried to adopt, and I recognize you had wanted to raise this before the jurors came in, but is not to interrupt the deliberations if at all possible, so taking the opportunity of either following a note or when their lunch is being brought in as a moment to speak to any of them as needed.

Number 2, it's a little bit more than a short break if you think about enabling them to make plans for Monday. So there would be a break in assessing the juror's exam situation, then we'd have to reconvene and discuss and agree upon a plan, then if we were to give the jurors a break at that point, it would need to be long enough for them to go downstairs, get their phones and the like, make calls. And my concern is, the more we do that, the less time they have today to deliberate and the more time they have today to deliberate, the more likely we'll get to a conclusion, or at least one can't know for sure, but more time to deliberate by its nature means more

time to come to some determination.

MR. SHIN: You've convinced me, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm amazed you could understand me.

MR. SHIN: I was able to understand you. As long as the inquiry is made at some point today, I think your Honor's proposal for addressing it as lunch is brought in is sensible. But as long as the inquiry is made so we have the relevant facts, that's the more important point. And I think on that, we're all in agreement.

THE COURT: If we bring them in as their lunch is being brought in, I'm open to suggestions. My basic thinking would be juror number 5 has inquired, so my inclination would be to meet with her, make clear I don't want to hear anything about her deliberations or the thought process or the like, let her know that if the process is not complete by Friday -- and I suppose we can bracket for a moment whether or not using tomorrow is an option, but let's -- so for now, I'll say if the process is not complete by Sunday, I want her to know that she'll be able to go on her trip.

My thinking is to leave it at that, no further explanation one way or the other, because I don't know yet as to how we'll proceed, but at least that takes any wonder she has as to her own fate come Sunday off the table.

Then I think, and maybe this would be in the reverse order, I would bring in the jury, let them know that juror

number 5 has indicated that she wants to raise a scheduling 1 2 concern and indicate that I'll meet with her, and then say 3 something along the lines that involves next week, and then say 4 something along the lines, of course, if anyone else has any 5 immovable conflicts, to the extent that the process is not 6 complete today, they should communicate that to Ms. Nuñez so 7 that I can address it. Ms. Nuñez can then walk them back 8 toward the jury room, and any of them could approach her with 9 any issues to take up. That, I think, balances Mr. Klingeman 10 and Mr. Creizman's concern about not overly planting a seed, not stepping on the toes of deliberations today, but making 11 clear that there is an outlet available to communicate, which I 12 13 think they know and it's been exercised by a few as to that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess my thinking is, juror number 2, and you're right, there had been the express concern about an exam toward the end of the trial when a few jurors indicated issues, which we addressed, and I think it was also phrased as needing to study for the exam and the like. So I guess my feeling is that that would provide a clear window for letting Ms. Nuñez know.

As they're going back, I would take juror number 5 into the robing room and proceed as I indicated.

MR. KLINGEMAN: I totally agree. I just wanted to repeat my request that we notify the alternates. Looking ahead to the issue of whether we go to 11, I would -- I can tell you I'm going to ask the Court not to exercise any discretion in

and so that will be a factor in my consideration as to good cause, as we learn what other potential scheduling issues or not there are.

Mr. Shin.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SHIN: Just on the alternates, your Honor. The government agrees with your Honor that it's too early to know whether we're going to need to call any of them in on Monday.

And again, given the number of jurors who may raise issues when the Court makes that available for them after calling them in, and also given that we don't know whether your Honor might choose to go to 11 versus seat an alternate, so we would just be — I think we'd be opposed to calling anyone in at this point until we have more information.

THE COURT: Why not take the prophylactic step? It doesn't cut off any options.

MR. SHIN: I'm sorry. The prophylactic step would be to contact them?

THE COURT: Alert them, as we did with the two over the snow day, there's a possibility that their presence will be needed come Monday to find out if there are any -- have

Ms. Nuñez just alert them to that, make sure we have contact information, and have her inquire if there are any unmovable conflicts that would interfere with their being summoned back come Monday.

MR. SHIN: That limited step seems fine to the alerting function and to inquire whether they have any conflicts. I think we would just be opposed at this point to actually having them called in until we know more. But I think what your Honor proposed, the limited contact as a prophylactic

1 measure, seems fine.

2.3

THE COURT: That's what you're seeking, Mr. Klingeman?

MR. KLINGEMAN: Exactly.

THE COURT: Great. We're in vigorous agreement. Let me just repeat the plan.

If we don't have a decision by the lunch break, when the lunch arrives, before it's brought in, we'll bring them out, I'll indicate that juror number 5 has communicated to Ms. Nuñez an upcoming conflict beginning next week if the process is not complete by the end of the day today, and indicate that I'll speak to that juror in the robing room and ask the other jurors to enjoy their lunch but pause deliberations until that juror returns.

I'll say also, if the process is not complete by the end of the day, if there are other jurors that foresee immovable conflicts as to next week, they should alert Ms. Nuñez on the way back to the jury room, give her a brief description, and then I'll be able to address the issue. That is the plan.

There is the alerting the alternate jurors as to the possibility they might be needed starting Monday and getting a read on their availability.

To follow through with respect to juror number 5, I would take her into the robing room with the court reporter, warn her about no discussions regarding deliberations, make the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

inquiry which is what's only been communicated through

2 Ms. Nuñez at this point, but make the inquiry as to the

upcoming conflict and then simply let her know that if the

process is not complete, she will be able to travel as planned.

MR. SHIN: That sounds fine, your Honor. Just one -your Honor raised the issue of Saturday, tomorrow.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SHIN: I don't think we have this fully thought out, but the question is, when your Honor has them in to provide this information over the lunch break, would it make sense at that point to remind them of the possibility of staying late today and even deliberating tomorrow if -- again, if they're available and if they agree and, obviously, if they haven't reached a decision by then, just because it may not be immediately obvious to them that that's an option, and given that --

THE COURT: It's not yet immediately obvious to me that it's an option.

MR. SHIN: I wanted to raise that for discussion given that if that is something we would want to alert them about, the lunch break might be the natural time to do it. So I just wanted to flag that for your Honor, and I guess open it up for discussion.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CREIZMAN: Your Honor, I can't say I'm the most

THE COURT: It's just the lunch order.

My law clerk is proving his versatility and sending me a weather forecast.

I suppose a soft version is something along the lines of what Mr. Shin suggested, remind them, as with the other days, if the process is not complete by the end of the day, it's up to them as to when they stop, whether it's 5:00, or if proceeding beyond 5:00 is what they wish they should simply let us know. I could plant the seed, too, that it is up to them, if whatever time they decided they need to stop, if they would deem it possible and helpful to them to have time tomorrow, that, too, could be arranged and they should simply let the Court know through note, as they have with end of the day time.

MR. SHIN: That sounds. Many leaves it essentially in their hands.

MR. KLINGEMAN: I agree, your Honor. And just so you know where we're coming from, we want to keep the deliberations going so --

THE COURT: I know. Yes. And of course, it's just — we all want to — it's that balance between giving them options and making sure there are no expectations as to the amount of time it takes, nor obstacles to their continuing their deliberations if that's what they choose.

I think we have our plan. I think we'll stick to that as the timing plan even if we were to get a note. I just think

discuss the case with anyone, I ask that you please share only

your views and that you respect the privacy of the deliberation

Please do not share the views of any other jurors.

2.3

24

25

Let me say my sincere thanks on behalf of myself, on behalf of the Court, the parties for your attention, time, and service.

I'll dismiss you to return to the jury room to get your things and be on your way. I'll tell you that if you'd like to stay for a few moments, I'll come to the jury room in a few moments to thank each of you for your service. But again, you're absolutely free to go as you like, but if you'd like to stay for a few moments, I'll be down in the jury room shortly.

Once again, I am deeply grateful for your service. You are dismissed. Thank you.

(Jury dismissed)

THE COURT: The jury verdict form, the completed form will be marked as Court Exhibit 10.

Counsel.

2.3

MR. SHIN: Your Honor, the government has an application on bail as to each defendant, if your Honor would like to take that up at this time.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. SHIN: We're not seeking to remand either defendant at this time, your Honor, but in light of the shifting standard that applies post conviction, the government is seeking an increase -- a modification in the bail terms for each of the defendants.

My recollection is that Defendant Lebedev is out on a

1 \$25,000 bond with -- my memory fails me as to whether it's one

2 or two cosigners. We would seek at this time that

Mr. Lebedev's bond be increased to \$250,000 with three

4 | financially responsible persons cosigning.

As to Mr. Gross, my recollection is that his bond is \$100,000, again, with either one -- I believe it's one cosigner. The government would seek at this time a \$500,000 bond for Mr. Gross with three financially responsible persons.

The basis for our differential request as between the two defendants is principally based on Defendant Gross' greater role in the crime, as well as his obstructive conduct in the case, and his, what the government will argue at sentencing, was perjury during his testimony, and so we would ask for an increase in those respective bail conditions.

We would also ask for Mr. Gross that there be a bail condition that any access that he may have to the Hope Cathedral financial accounts be terminated in some way. As your Honor heard during the trial, there was evidence that the government offered regarding his access to the accounts and his use of the accounts essentially for his personal use, taking funds, writing checks to himself, his personal use of the accounts, and in light of that, the government would request that any access to those accounts be terminated as a condition of his bail.

THE COURT: What's the government's position with

respect to time to satisfy, if I grant such a request?

MR. SHIN: Typically, for those sorts of things, typically the magistrate judges give a week to satisfy conditions like these, and so we would propose one week, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Creizman.

2.3

MR. CREIZMAN: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Lebedev's bond is signed by his wife and his mother and him, obviously. I understand the government's application for an increased amount, but I don't believe that such a significant increase is warranted, or any increase in the number of cosigners.

Mr. Lebedev has completely complied with all of his pretrial obligations, and he's shown up to court every day. He's appeared for everything.

THE COURT: Here's what I -- I think what I'd like to do is to get -- since the government is agreeing to a week before any changes are made, I'm going to take a brief written submission on this and give folks time to think about it and know what's available, and I want to think about it and also confirm with probation that all conditions have been met and the like.

The government's submission I'll ask by the end of the day today, and Monday for the defendants'.

MR. CREIZMAN: Monday.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CREIZMAN: Your Honor, if your Honor would be open to this application. This jury obviously put a lot of time into deliberating and has thought about it. And if your Honor were to ask the jurors at their option, whoever wants to stay could stay, but if they are interested in meeting, counsel just who has some questions, not for any other purpose, just to